



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/218,660	12/22/1998	EVAN C. UNGER	UNGR-1520	2775

7590

04/11/2002

DAVID A. CHERRY, WOODCOCK WASHBURN KURTZ
MACKIEWICZ & NORRIS
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

SHARAREH, SHAHNAM J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/218,660

Applicant(s)

UNGER ET AL.

Examiner

Shahnam Sharareh

Art Unit

1617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 March 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 15 March 2002. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
- NOTE: _____
3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 100, 102, 103, 113, 115, 122, 124, 127, 194-200, 203, 210-238, 245-248, 255-270, 277-280, 287-292, 294-300, 303 and 310-329, 331-337, 347-411.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☒ Other: A copy of IDS filed on 9/13/01 is enclosed

RUSSELL TRAVERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons of record. Lanza US Patent 5,989,520 anticipates claims 100, 102, 127, 194, 203-204, 303, 320-329, 331-337 under 35 USC 102 (e). Applicant's argument that Lanza is not a proper 102 (e) has been considered but are not found persuasive. Lanza's disclosure is properly supported in its parents' applications. Example 18 of Lanza's '520 is only one embodiment of Lanza's formulations. Moreover, as recognized by Applicant, Lanza teaches gaseous perfluorocarbon in his formulations (see col 7, line 1-17) and direct or indirect linkage of a targeting moiety to the phospholipid wall (col 5, line 20-60, col 11, lines 28-40, examples 1-7). Applicant's arguments that Lanza's hydrophilic polymer linking group is not the same as instant groups as described in the specification and examples of this application, is not persuasive, because the pending claims are neither directed to any specific linking groups nor is the definition of the instant specification exclusive. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of pending claims Under 35 USC 103(a) over Porter, Lanza, Konigesberug or Trubetsko, Ginsberg and Siegal have been fully considered but are not found persuasive, because the rejection is based on the combined teachings of the references. Accordingly, all elements of the pending claims are taught as shown in the previous Office Action, thus, rendering the claimed invention obvious over the teachings of prior art. . .